

Crystalline Color Superconductivity

Krishna Rajagopal

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, MA, USA 02139. E-mail: krishna@ctp.mit.edu*

Abstract. We give an introduction crystalline color superconductivity, arguing that it is likely to occur wherever quark matter in which color-flavor locking does not occur is found. We survey the properties of this form of quark matter, and argue that its presence in a compact star may result in pulsar glitches, and thus in observable consequences. However, elucidation of this proposal requires an understanding of the crystal structure, which is not yet in hand.

INTRODUCTION

At asymptotic densities, the ground state of QCD with three quarks with equal masses is expected to be the color-flavor locked (CFL) phase [1, 2, 3]. This phase features a condensate of Cooper pairs of quarks which includes ud , us , and ds pairs. Quarks of all colors and all flavors participate in the pairing, and all excitations with quark quantum numbers are gapped.

The CFL phase persists for unequal quark masses, so long as the differences are not too large [4, 5]. It is very likely the ground state for real QCD, assumed to be in equilibrium with respect to the weak interactions, over a substantial range of densities. In this phase, chiral symmetry is broken via the locking of left-flavor and right-flavor symmetries to color [1]. Terms of order m_s^4 in the effective Lagrangian for the resulting pseudo-Goldstone bosons [6] may rotate the CFL condensate in the K^0 direction [7], resulting in further pseudo-Goldstone bosons [8]. Throughout the range of parameters over which the CFL phase exists as a bulk (and therefore electrically neutral) phase, it consists of equal numbers of u , d and s quarks and is therefore electrically neutral in the absence of any electrons [9]. The equality of the three quark number densities is enforced in the CFL phase by the fact that this equality maximizes the pairing energy associated with the formation of ud , us , and ds Cooper pairs. This equality is enforced even though the strange quark, with mass m_s , is heavier than the light quarks. If higher order effects do in fact introduce an additional K^0 condensate, the conclusion that the CFL phase is electrically neutral in the absence of electrons remains, because K^0 mesons are neutral.

If one imagines increasing m_s (or, more physically, decreasing μ) color-flavor locking is maintained until a transition to a state of quark matter in which some quarks remain ungapped. This “unlocking transition”, which must be first order [4, 5], occurs when $m_s^2 \approx 4\mu\Delta_0$ [9, 10]. In this expression, Δ_0 is the BCS pairing gap, estimated in both models and asymptotic analyses to be of order tens to 100 MeV [3]. The strange quark mass m_s is a density-dependent effective mass [11]. For $\mu \sim 400 - 500$ MeV,

corresponding to quark matter at densities which may arise at the center of compact stars, m_s is certainly significantly larger than the current quark mass, and its value is not known. In drawing the QCD phase diagram, therefore, there are two possibilities. As a function of decreasing μ , one possibility is a first order phase transition directly from color-flavor locked quark matter to hadronic matter, as explored in Ref. [10]. The second possibility is an unlocking transition [4, 5] to quark matter in which not all quarks participate in the dominant pairing, followed only at a lower μ by a transition to hadronic matter. We assume the second possibility here, and explore its consequences.

In quark matter in which CFL pairing involving all quarks does not occur, it is likely that up and down quarks continue to pair. In this 2SC phase, which was the earliest color superconducting phase to be studied [12], the attractive channel involves the formation of Cooper pairs which are antisymmetric in both color and flavor, yielding a condensate with color (greek indices) and flavor (latin indices) structure $\langle q_a^\alpha q_b^\beta \rangle \sim \epsilon_{ab} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta 3}$. This condensate leaves five quarks unpaired: up and down quarks of the third color, and strange quarks of all three colors. Because the BCS pairing scheme leaves ungapped quarks with differing Fermi momenta, it is natural to ask whether there is some generalization of the pairing ansatz, beyond BCS, in which pairing between two species of quarks persists even once their Fermi momenta differ. Crystalline color superconductivity is the answer to this question.

THE CRYSTALLINE COLOR SUPERCONDUCTING STATE

To date, crystalline color superconductivity has only been studied in the simplified model context in which one considers only pairing between massless up and down quarks whose Fermi momenta we attempt to push apart by turning on a chemical potential difference [15, 16, 17, 18], rather than considering CFL pairing in the presence of quark mass differences. That is, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_u &= \mu - \delta\mu \\ \mu_d &= \mu + \delta\mu.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

If $\delta\mu$ is nonzero but less than some $\delta\mu_1$, the ground state is precisely that obtained for $\delta\mu = 0$ [19, 20, 15]. In this 2SC state, red and green up and down quarks pair, yielding four quasiparticles with superconducting gap Δ_0 [12]. Furthermore, the number density of red and green up quarks is the same as that of red and green down quarks. As long as $\delta\mu$ is not too large, this BCS state remains unchanged (and favored) because maintaining equal number densities, and thus coincident Fermi surfaces, maximizes the pairing and hence the gain in interaction energy. As $\delta\mu$ is increased, the BCS state remains the ground state of the system only as long as its negative interaction energy offsets the large positive free energy cost associated with forcing the Fermi seas to deviate from their normal state distributions. In the weak coupling limit, in which $\Delta_0/\mu \ll 1$, the BCS state persists for $\delta\mu < \delta\mu_1 = \Delta_0/\sqrt{2}$ [19, 15]. These conclusions are the same (as long as $\Delta_0/\mu \ll 1$) whether the interaction between quarks is modeled as a point-like four-fermion interaction or is approximated by single-gluon exchange [3]. The loss of BCS pairing at $\delta\mu = \delta\mu_1$ is the analogue in this toy model of the unlocking transition.

If $\delta\mu$ is too large, no pairing between species is possible. The transition between the BCS and unpaired states as $\delta\mu$ increases past $\delta\mu_1$ has been studied in electron superconductors [19] and QCD superconductors [4, 5, 20] assuming that no other state intervenes. However, there is good reason to think that another state can occur. This is the “LOFF” state, first explored by Larkin and Ovchinnikov[13] and Fulde and Ferrell[14] in the context of electron superconductivity in the presence of magnetic impurities. They found that near the unpairing transition, in a range $\delta\mu_1 < \delta\mu < \delta\mu_2$, it is favorable to form a state in which the Cooper pairs have nonzero momentum. This generalization of the pairing ansatz (beyond BCS ansätze in which only quarks with momenta which add to zero pair) is favored because it gives rise to a region of phase space where each of the two quarks in a pair can be close to its Fermi surface, and such pairs can be created at low cost in free energy. Condensates of this sort spontaneously break translational and rotational invariance, leading to gaps which vary periodically in a crystalline pattern. If in some shell within the quark matter core of a neutron star (or within a strange quark star) the quark number densities are such that crystalline color superconductivity arises, rotational vortices may be pinned in this shell, making it a locus for glitch phenomena [15].

In Ref. [15], we have evaluated the width of the window $\delta\mu_1 < \delta\mu < \delta\mu_2$ for which crystalline color superconductivity occurs, upon making the simplifying assumption that quarks interact via a four-fermion interaction with the quantum numbers of single gluon exchange.

In the LOFF state, each Cooper pair carries momentum $2\mathbf{q}$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \approx 1.2\delta\mu$. The condensate and gap parameter vary in space with wavelength $\pi/|\mathbf{q}|$. Although the magnitude $|\mathbf{q}|$ is determined energetically, as we sketch below, the direction $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is chosen spontaneously. The LOFF state is characterized by a gap parameter Δ and a diquark condensate, but not by an energy gap in the dispersion relation: we obtain the quasiparticle dispersion relations[15] and find that they vary with the direction of the momentum, yielding gaps that vary from zero up to a maximum of Δ . The condensate is dominated by the regions in momentum space in which a quark pair with total momentum $2\mathbf{q}$ has both members of the pair within $\sim \Delta$ of their respective Fermi surfaces. These regions form circular bands on the two Fermi surfaces. Choosing a single, fixed, $\mathbf{q}$ means that only one circular band on each Fermi surface participates in the pairing. In all work published to date, we assume that all Cooper pairs make the same choice of direction $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. Making this ansatz corresponds to choosing a single circular band on each Fermi surface. In position space, it corresponds to a condensate which varies in space like

$$\langle \psi(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \propto \Delta e^{2i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{x}} . \quad (2)$$

This ansatz is certainly *not* the best choice. If a single plane wave is favored, why not two? That is, if one choice of $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is favored, why not add a second $\mathbf{q}$, with the same $|\mathbf{q}|$ but a different $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$? If two are favored, why not three? This question, namely the determination of the favored crystal structure of the crystalline color superconductor phase, remains open. Note, however, that if we find a region $\delta\mu_1 < \delta\mu < \delta\mu_2$ in which the simple LOFF ansatz, with a single $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, is favored over the BCS state and over no pairing, then the LOFF state with whatever crystal structure turns out to be optimal must be favored in *at least* this region. Note also that even the single $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ ansatz, which we use henceforth,

breaks translational and rotational invariance spontaneously. The resulting phonon has been analyzed in considerable detail in Ref. [17]. It will be very interesting to use these methods to analyze the phonons in more complicated crystal structures.

Having simplified the interaction by making it pointlike, and simplified the ansatz by assuming the condensate varies like a plane wave, in Ref. [15] we give the ansatz for the LOFF wave function, and by variation obtain a gap equation which allows us to solve for the gap parameter Δ , the free energy and the values of the diquark condensates which characterize the LOFF state at a given $\delta\mu$ and $|\mathbf{q}|$. We then vary $|\mathbf{q}|$, to find the preferred (lowest free energy) LOFF state at a given $\delta\mu$, and compare the free energy of the LOFF state to that of the BCS state with which it competes.¹

Crystalline color superconductivity is favored for $\delta\mu_1 < \delta\mu < \delta\mu_2$. As $\delta\mu$ increases, one finds a first order phase transition from the ordinary BCS phase to the crystalline color superconducting phase at $\delta\mu = \delta\mu_1$ and then a second order phase transition at $\delta\mu = \delta\mu_2$ at which Δ decreases to zero. Because the condensation energy in the LOFF phase is much smaller than that of the BCS condensate at $\delta\mu = 0$, the value of $\delta\mu_1$ is almost identical to that at which the naive unpairing transition from the BCS state to the state with no pairing would occur if one ignored the possibility of a LOFF phase, namely $\delta\mu_1 = \Delta_0/\sqrt{2}$. For all practical purposes, therefore, the LOFF gap equation is not required in order to determine $\delta\mu_1$. The LOFF gap equation is used to determine $\delta\mu_2$ and the properties of the crystalline color superconducting phase [15].

We find that the LOFF gap parameter decreases from $0.23\Delta_0$ at $\delta\mu = \delta\mu_1$ to zero at $\delta\mu = \delta\mu_2$ [15]. The critical temperature above which the LOFF state melts is $T_c = \Delta\sqrt{3/2\pi^2}$ [21, 16], which means that, except for very close to $\delta\mu_2$, T_c will be much higher than typical neutron star temperatures.

In the limit of a weak four-fermion interaction, $G \rightarrow 0$, the crystalline color superconductivity window is bounded by $\delta\mu_1 = \Delta_0/\sqrt{2}$ and $\delta\mu_2 = 0.754\Delta_0$, as first demonstrated in Refs. [13, 14]. These results have been extended beyond the $G \rightarrow 0$ limit in Ref. [15]. Note that the BCS gap Δ_0 increases monotonically with G . We may therefore use Δ_0 to parametrize the strength of the interaction G . This proves convenient because, as we have seen, both $\delta\mu_1$ and $\delta\mu_2$ are given simply in terms of the physical quantity Δ_0 . (Writing them in terms of the model-dependent parameters G and Λ requires unwieldy expressions.) As first recognized by Refs. [13, 14], at any fixed $\delta\mu$ the LOFF phase only occurs when the interaction strength (that is, Δ_0) lies in a specified window. LOFF pairing does not survive the weak-coupling ($\Delta_0 \rightarrow 0$) limit at fixed $\delta\mu$, because in this limit the width of the band on the Fermi surface in which pairing occurs goes to zero. On the other hand, if one takes $\delta\mu$ and Δ_0 both to zero while keeping $\delta\mu/\Delta_0$ fixed and in the appropriate range, LOFF pairing persists down to arbitrarily weak coupling [13, 14, 15].

¹ Our model Hamiltonian has two parameters, the four-fermion coupling G and a cutoff Λ . We often use the value of Δ_0 , the BCS gap obtained at $\delta\mu = 0$, to describe the strength of the interaction: small Δ_0 corresponds to small G . When we wish to study the dependence on the cutoff, we vary Λ while at the same time varying the coupling G such that Δ_0 is kept fixed. We find that the relation between other physical quantities and Δ_0 is reasonably insensitive to variation of Λ .

OPENING THE CRYSTALLINE COLOR SUPERCONDUCTIVITY WINDOW

The first part of this section is more technical than the rest of this paper. Some readers may wish to skip to the text after Eqs. (15,16).

The variational derivation of the gap equation for the crystalline color superconducting phase is somewhat cumbersome [15]. One constructs a variational ansatz in which only quarks within a “pairing region” are allowed to pair, minimizes the free energy with respect to all variational parameters (two per mode in momentum, color, flavor and spin space), and obtains a self-consistency relation which may then be solved to obtain Δ . The intricacy arises from the fact that the definition of the boundary of the pairing region involves Δ itself. In Ref. [16], we provide a diagrammatic rederivation in which one simply makes an ansatz for the quantum numbers of the condensate and then “turns a field-theoretical crank” and sees this intricate result emerge. We then use the diagrammatic derivation to analyze the LOFF phase at nonzero temperature, obtaining the result for T_c given in the previous section. The diagrammatic formalism also allows us to go beyond a point-like interaction, and treat the exchange of a propagating gluon [18]. Before presenting the results of this generalization of the interaction, we first sketch the diagrammatic derivation of the gap equation.

In the crystalline color superconducting phase, the condensate contains pairs of u and d quarks with momenta such that the total momentum of each Cooper pair is given by $2\mathbf{q}$, with the direction of $\mathbf{q}$ chosen spontaneously. As noted above, wherever there is an instability towards (2), we expect the true ground state to be a crystalline condensate which varies in space like a sum of several such plane waves with the same $|\mathbf{q}|$.

In order to describe pairing between u quarks with momentum $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}$ and d quarks with momentum $-\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}$, we must use a modified Nambu-Gorkov spinor defined as

$$\Psi(p, q) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_u(p + q) \\ \psi_d(p - q) \\ \bar{\psi}_d^T(-p + q) \\ \bar{\psi}_u^T(-p - q) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Note that by q we mean the four-vector $(0, \mathbf{q})$. The Cooper pairs have nonzero total momentum, and the ground state condensate (2) is static. The momentum dependence of (3) is motivated by the fact that in the presence of a crystalline color superconducting condensate, anomalous propagation does not only mean picking up or losing two quarks from the condensate. It also means picking up or losing momentum $2\mathbf{q}$. The basis (3) has been chosen so that the inverse fermion propagator in the crystalline color superconducting phase is diagonal in p -space and is given by

$$S^{-1}(p, q) = \begin{bmatrix} \not{p}' + \not{q}' + \mu_u \gamma_0 & 0 & -\bar{\Delta}(p, -q) & 0 \\ 0 & \not{p}' - \not{q}' + \mu_d \gamma_0 & 0 & \bar{\Delta}(p, q) \\ -\Delta(p, -q) & 0 & (\not{p}' - \not{q}' - \mu_d \gamma_0)^T & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta(p, q) & 0 & (\not{p}' + \not{q}' - \mu_u \gamma_0)^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{\Delta} = \gamma_0 \Delta^\dagger \gamma_0$ and, here, Δ is a matrix proportional to $C\gamma_5 \epsilon^{\alpha\beta 3}$. Note that the condensate is explicitly antisymmetric in flavor. $2\mathbf{p}$ is the relative momentum of the quarks in a given pair and is different for different pairs. In the gap equation below, we shall integrate over p_0 and $\mathbf{p}$. As desired, the off-diagonal blocks describe anomalous propagation in the presence of a condensate of diquarks with momentum $2\mathbf{q}$.

We obtain the gap equation by solving the one-loop Schwinger-Dyson equation given by

$$S^{-1}(k, q) - S_0^{-1}(k, q) = -g^2 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \Gamma_\mu^A S(p, q) \Gamma_\nu^B D_{AB}^{\mu\nu}(k - p), \quad (5)$$

where $D_{AB}^{\mu\nu} = D^{\mu\nu} \delta_{AB}$ is the gluon propagator, S is the full quark propagator, whose inverse is given by (4), and S_0 is the fermion propagator in the absence of interaction, given by S with $\Delta = 0$. The vertices are defined as follows:

$$\Gamma_\mu^A = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_\mu \lambda^A/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_\mu \lambda^A/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -(\gamma_\mu \lambda^A/2)^T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -(\gamma_\mu \lambda^A/2)^T \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

In Refs. [15, 16], we introduce a point-like interaction by replacing $g^2 D^{\mu\nu}$ by $g^{\mu\nu}$ times a constant G . After some algebra (essentially the determination of S given S^{-1} specified above), and upon suitable projection, the Schwinger-Dyson equation (5) reduces to a gap equation for the gap parameter Δ given (in Euclidean space) by

$$\Delta = 2G \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{4\Delta w}{w^2 - 4[(|\mathbf{p}|^2 - (ip_0 + \delta\mu)^2)(\mu^2 - |\mathbf{q}|^2) + (\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} + \mu(ip_0 + \delta\mu))^2]} \quad (7)$$

where $w = |\mathbf{p}|^2 - |\mathbf{q}|^2 - (ip_0 + \delta\mu)^2 + \mu^2 + \Delta^2$. We show in Ref. [16] that upon neglecting the (small) contributions of antiparticle pairing, this gap equation simplifies to

$$\Delta = 2G \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{2\Delta \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}}{(p_0 - iE_1(\mathbf{p}))(p_0 + iE_2(\mathbf{p}))} \quad (8)$$

where $E_{1,2}(\mathbf{p})$ are defined as in Ref. [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(\mathbf{p}) &= +\delta\mu + \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}| - |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}|) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}| + |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}| - 2\mu)^2 + 4\Delta^2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}} \\ E_2(\mathbf{p}) &= -\delta\mu - \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}| - |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}|) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}| + |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}| - 2\mu)^2 + 4\Delta^2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and β is defined as the angle between the up quark momentum $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p}$ and the down quark momentum $\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}$. Upon doing the p_0 integration, we obtain the gap equation derived variationally in Ref. [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= 2G \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}}{E_1(\mathbf{p}) + E_2(\mathbf{p})} \\ &= 2G \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}}{\sqrt{(|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}| + |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}| - 2\mu)^2 + 4\Delta^2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta}{2}}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the “pairing region” $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbf{p}$ -space is given by

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{p} \mid E_1(\mathbf{p}) > 0 \text{ and } E_2(\mathbf{p}) > 0\} . \quad (11)$$

Thus, an exercise in residue calculus has reproduced the blocking regions, excluding from the gap equation those regions in momentum space where $E_1(\mathbf{p})$ or $E_2(\mathbf{p})$ is negative. Note that because $E_1(\mathbf{p}) + E_2(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$, as can be seen from the definitions (9), there is no value of $\mathbf{p}$ for which both E_1 and E_2 are negative. Note also that the gap equation is dominated by those regions in momentum space where $E_1(\mathbf{p}) + E_2(\mathbf{p})$ is as small as possible, where the integrand in (10) is of order $1/\Delta$. These values of $\mathbf{p}$ are such that both members of a LOFF pair have momenta close to (within $\sim \Delta$ of) their respective Fermi surfaces. That is, $|\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}|$ is within Δ of μ_u and $|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}|$ is within Δ of μ_d . The results described in the previous section all follow from analysis of the gap equation (10) [13, 14, 21, 15].

In Ref. [18], we begin with the Schwinger-Dyson equation (5) but this time keep the gluon propagator. That is, we analyze the crystalline color superconducting phase upon assuming that quarks interact by the exchange of a medium-modified gluon, as is quantitatively valid at asymptotically high densities. The medium-modified gluon propagator is given by

$$D_{\mu\nu}(p) = \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^T}{p^2 - G(p)} + \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^L}{p^2 - F(p)} - \xi \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^4} , \quad (12)$$

where ξ is the gauge parameter, $G(p)$ and $F(p)$ are functions of p_0 and $|\mathbf{p}|$, and the projectors $P_{\mu\nu}^{T,L}$ are defined as follows:

$$P_{ij}^T = \delta_{ij} - \hat{p}_i \hat{p}_j, \quad P_{00}^T = P_{0i}^T = 0, \quad P_{\mu\nu}^L = -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2} - P_{\mu\nu}^T. \quad (13)$$

The functions F and G describe the effects of the medium on the gluon propagator. If we neglect the Meissner effect (that is, if we neglect the modification of $F(p)$ and $G(p)$ due to the gap Δ in the fermion propagator) then $F(p)$ describes Thomas-Fermi screening and $G(p)$ describes Landau damping and they are given in the hard dense loop (HDL) approximation by [22]

$$\begin{aligned} F(p) &= m^2 \frac{p^2}{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \left(1 - \frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} Q_0 \left(\frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} \right) \right), \quad \text{with } Q_0(x) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{x+1}{x-1} \right), \\ G(p) &= \frac{1}{2} m^2 \frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} \left[\left(1 - \left(\frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} \right)^2 \right) Q_0 \left(\frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} \right) + \frac{ip_0}{|\mathbf{p}|} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $m^2 = g^2 \mu^2 / \pi^2$ is the Debye mass for $N_f = 2$. The further modification to the gluon propagator due to the Meissner effect in spatially uniform color superconducting phases has been the subject of much recent work [23], but the Meissner effect in the crystalline color superconducting phase has not yet been analyzed. Fortunately, in our calculation of $\delta\mu_2$ we shall only need to study the crystalline color superconducting phase in the limit in which $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, and in this limit the expressions (12) and (14) are valid.

Upon neglecting the (small) contributions from antiparticle pairing, the gap equation becomes

$$\Delta(k_0) = \frac{-ig^2}{3\sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,k)}{2}} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\Delta(p_0)}{(p_0 + E_1)(p_0 - E_2)} \times \left[\frac{C_F}{(k-p)^2 - F(k-p)} + \frac{C_G}{(k-p)^2 - G(k-p)} + \frac{C_\xi \xi}{(k-p)^2} \right], \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_F &= \cos^2 \frac{\beta(k,p)}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\beta(p,k)}{2} - \cos^2 \frac{\beta(k,-p)}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\beta(-p,k)}{2} - \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,k)}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,p)}{2}, \\ C_G &= \frac{\cos \beta(k,-p) \cos \beta(-p,k) - \cos \beta(k,p) \cos \beta(p,k)}{2} - 2 \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,k)}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,p)}{2} \\ &\quad - \cos \alpha(k,p) \left(\cos \alpha(p,k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,-p)}{2} + \cos \alpha(-p,-k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,p)}{2} \right) \\ &\quad - \cos \alpha(-k,-p) \left(\cos \alpha(p,k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,k)}{2} + \cos \alpha(-p,-k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(-p,k)}{2} \right), \\ C_\xi &= \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,p)}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,k)}{2} - \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,k)}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,p)}{2} - \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,-p)}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\beta(-p,k)}{2} \\ &\quad + \cos \alpha(k,p) \left(\cos \alpha(p,k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,-p)}{2} + \cos \alpha(-p,-k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(k,p)}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + \cos \alpha(-k,-p) \left(\cos \alpha(p,k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(p,k)}{2} + \cos \alpha(-p,-k) \sin^2 \frac{\beta(-p,k)}{2} \right), \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

with E_1 and E_2 as in (9), and where $\cos \alpha(k,p) = (\widehat{k-q}) \cdot (\widehat{k-p})$ and $\cos \beta(k,p) = (\widehat{q+k}) \cdot (\widehat{q-p})$. In Ref. [18], we use this gap equation to obtain $\delta\mu_2$, the upper boundary of the crystalline color superconductivity window. This analysis is controlled at asymptotically high densities where the coupling g is weak.

At weak coupling, quark-quark scattering by single-gluon exchange is dominated by forward scattering. In most scatterings, the angular positions of the quarks on their respective Fermi surfaces do not change much. As a consequence, the weaker the coupling the more the physics can be thought of as a sum of many $(1+1)$ -dimensional theories, with only rare large-angle scatterings able to connect one direction in momentum space with others [24]. In the LOFF state, small-angle scattering is advantageous because it cannot scatter a pair of quarks out of the region of momentum space in which both members of the pair are in their respective rings, where pairing is favored. This means that it is natural to expect that a forward-scattering-dominated interaction like single-gluon exchange is much more favorable for crystalline color superconductivity than a point-like interaction, which yields s -wave scattering.

Suppose for a moment that we were analyzing a truly $(1+1)$ -dimensional theory. The momentum-space geometry of the LOFF state in one spatial dimension is qualitatively different from that in three. Instead of Fermi surfaces, we would have only “Fermi points” at $\pm\mu_u$ and $\pm\mu_d$. The only choice of $|\mathbf{q}|$ which allows pairing between u and d

quarks at their respective Fermi points is $|\mathbf{q}| = \delta\mu$. In $(3+1)$ dimensions, in contrast, $|\mathbf{q}| > \delta\mu$ is favored because it allows LOFF pairing in ring-shaped regions of the Fermi surface, rather than just at antipodal points [13, 14, 15]. Also, in striking contrast to the $(3+1)$ -dimensional case, it has long been known that in a true $(1+1)$ -dimensional theory with a point-like interaction between fermions, $\delta\mu_2/\Delta_0 \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak-interaction limit [25].

We expect that in $(3+1)$ -dimensional QCD with the interaction given by single-gluon exchange, as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ and $g(\mu) \rightarrow 0$ the $(1+1)$ -dimensional results should be approached: the energetically favored value of $|\mathbf{q}|$ should become closer and closer to $\delta\mu$, and $\delta\mu_2/\Delta_0$ should diverge. We derive both these effects in Ref. [18] and furthermore show that both are clearly in evidence already at the rather large coupling $g = 3.43$, corresponding to $\mu = 400$ MeV using the conventions of Refs. [26, 27]. At this coupling, $\delta\mu_2/\Delta_0 \approx 1.2$, meaning that $(\delta\mu_2 - \delta\mu_1) \approx (1.2 - 1/\sqrt{2})\Delta_0$, which is much larger than $(0.754 - 1/\sqrt{2})\Delta_0$. If we go to much higher densities, where the calculation is under quantitative control, we find an even more striking enhancement: when $g = 0.79$ we find $\delta\mu_2/\Delta_0 > 1000$! We see that (relative to expectations based on experience with point-like interactions) the crystalline color superconductivity window is wider by more than four orders of magnitude at this weak coupling, and is about one order of magnitude wider at accessible densities if weak-coupling results are applied there.²

We have found that $\delta\mu_2/\Delta_0$ diverges in QCD as the weak-coupling, high-density limit is taken. Applying results valid at asymptotically high densities to those of interest in compact stars, namely $\mu \sim 400$ MeV, we find that even here the crystalline color superconductivity window is an order of magnitude wider than that obtained previously upon approximating the interaction between quarks as point-like. The crystalline color superconductivity window in parameter space may therefore be much wider than previously thought, making this phase a *generic* feature of the phase diagram for cold dense quark matter. The reason for this qualitative increase in $\delta\mu_2$ can be traced back to the fact that gluon exchange at weaker and weaker coupling is more and more dominated by forward-scattering, while point-like interactions describe *s*-wave scattering. What is perhaps surprising is that even at quite *large* values of g , gluon exchange yields an order of magnitude increase in $\delta\mu_2 - \delta\mu_1$.

This discovery has significant implications for the QCD phase diagram and may have significant implications for compact stars. At high enough baryon density the CFL phase in which all quarks pair to form a spatially uniform BCS condensate is favored. Suppose that as the density is lowered the nonzero strange quark mass induces the formation of some less symmetrically paired quark matter before the density is lowered so much that baryonic matter is obtained. In this less symmetric quark matter, some quarks may yet form a BCS condensate. Those which do not, however, will have

² LOFF condensates have also recently been considered in two other contexts. In QCD with $\mu_u < 0$, $\mu_d > 0$ and $\mu_u = -\mu_d$, one has equal Fermi momenta for $\bar{u}$ antiquarks and d quarks, BCS pairing occurs, and consequently a $\langle \bar{u}d \rangle$ condensate forms [28, 29]. If $-\mu_u$ and μ_d differ, and if the difference lies in the appropriate range, a LOFF phase with a spatially varying $\langle \bar{u}d \rangle$ condensate results [28, 29]. The result of Ref. [18] that the LOFF window is much wider than previously thought applies in this context also. Suitably isospin asymmetric nuclear matter may also admit LOFF pairing, as discussed recently in Ref. [30]. Here, the interaction is not forward-scattering dominated.

differing Fermi momenta. These will form a crystalline color superconducting phase if the differences between their Fermi momenta lie within the appropriate window. In QCD, the interaction between quarks is forward-scattering dominated and the crystalline color superconductivity window is consequently wide open. This phase is therefore generic, occurring almost anywhere there are some quarks which cannot form BCS pairs. Evaluating the critical temperature T_c above which the crystalline condensate melts requires solving the nonzero temperature gap equation obtained from (15) as done in Ref. [16] for the case of a point-like interaction. As in that case, we expect that all compact stars which are minutes old or older are much colder than T_c . This suggests that wherever quark matter which is not in the CFL phase occurs within a compact star, crystalline color superconductivity is to be found. As we discuss in the next section, wherever crystalline color superconductivity is found rotational vortices may be pinned resulting in the generation of glitches as the star spins down.

Solidifying the implications of our results requires further work in several directions. First, we must confirm that pushing Fermi surfaces apart via quark mass differences has the same effect as pushing them apart via a $\delta\mu$ introduced by hand. Second, we must extend the analysis to the three flavor theory of interest. And, third, before evaluating the pinning force on a rotational vortex and making predictions for glitch phenomena, we need to understand which crystal structure is favored.

GLITCHES IN COMPACT STARS

We do not yet know whether compact stars feature quark matter cores. And, we do not yet know whether, if they contain quark matter, that quark matter is color-flavor locked, meaning that quarks of all colors and flavors participate in BCS pairing, or whether the BCS condensate leaves some quarks unpaired. The lesson we take from the toy model analysis is that because the interaction between quarks in QCD is dominated by forward scattering, rather than being an s -wave point-like interaction, the difference in Fermi momenta between the unpaired quarks need not fall within a narrow window in order for them to form a crystalline color superconductor.

We wish now to ask whether the presence of a shell of crystalline color superconducting quark matter in a compact star (between the hadronic “mantle” and the CFL “inner core”) has observable consequences. A quantitative formulation of this question would allow one either to discover crystalline color superconductivity, or to rule out its presence. (The latter would imply either no quark matter at all, or a single CFL-nuclear interface [10].)

Many pulsars have been observed to glitch. Glitches are sudden jumps in rotation frequency Ω which may be as large as $\Delta\Omega/\Omega \sim 10^{-6}$, but may also be several orders of magnitude smaller. The frequency of observed glitches is statistically consistent with the hypothesis that all radio pulsars experience glitches [31]. Glitches are thought to originate from interactions between the rigid neutron star crust, typically somewhat more than a kilometer thick, and rotational vortices in a neutron superfluid. The inner kilometer of crust consists of a crystal lattice of nuclei immersed in a neutron superfluid [32]. Because the pulsar is spinning, the neutron superfluid (both within the inner crust and

deeper inside the star) is threaded with a regular array of rotational vortices. As the pulsar's spin gradually slows, these vortices must gradually move outwards since the rotation frequency of a superfluid is proportional to the density of vortices. Deep within the star, the vortices are free to move outwards. In the crust, however, the vortices are pinned by their interaction with the nuclear lattice. Models [33] differ in important respects as to how the stress associated with pinned vortices is released in a glitch: for example, the vortices may break and rearrange the crust, or a cluster of vortices may suddenly overcome the pinning force and move macroscopically outward, with the sudden decrease in the angular momentum of the superfluid within the crust resulting in a sudden increase in angular momentum of the rigid crust itself and hence a glitch. All the models agree that the fundamental requirements are the presence of rotational vortices in a superfluid and the presence of a rigid structure which impedes the motion of vortices and which encompasses enough of the volume of the pulsar to contribute significantly to the total moment of inertia.

Although it is premature to draw quantitative conclusions, it is interesting to speculate that some glitches may originate deep within a pulsar which features a quark matter core, in a region of that core which is in the crystalline color superconductor phase. A full three-flavor analysis is required, first of all in order to check whether the qualitative conclusions reached in the two-flavor analyses done to date persist, and second of all in order to determine whether the LOFF phase is a superfluid. If the only pairing is between u and d quarks, this 2SC phase is not a superfluid [4], whereas if the LOFF pairing involves the s quarks, as seems likely, a superfluid is obtained [1, 4]. Henceforth, we suppose that the LOFF phase is a superfluid, which means that if it occurs within a pulsar it will be threaded by an array of rotational vortices. It is reasonable to expect that these vortices will be pinned in a LOFF crystal, in which the diquark condensate varies periodically in space. The diquark condensate vanishes at the core of a rotational vortex, and for this reason the vortices will prefer to be located with their cores pinned to the nodes of the LOFF crystal.

A real calculation of the pinning force experienced by a vortex in a crystalline color superconductor must await the determination of the crystal structure of the LOFF phase. We can, however, attempt an order of magnitude estimate along the same lines as that done by Anderson and Itoh [35] for neutron vortices in the inner crust of a neutron star. In that context, this estimate has since been made quantitative [36, 37, 33]. For one specific choice of parameters [15], the LOFF phase is favored over the normal phase by a free energy $F_{\text{LOFF}} \sim 5 \times (10 \text{ MeV})^4$ and the spacing between nodes in the LOFF crystal is $b = \pi/(2|\mathbf{q}|) \sim 9 \text{ fm}$. The thickness of a rotational vortex is given by the correlation length $\xi \sim 1/\Delta \sim 25 \text{ fm}$. The pinning energy is the difference between the energy of a section of vortex of length b which is centered on a node of the LOFF crystal vs. one which is centered on a maximum of the LOFF crystal. It is of order $E_p \sim F_{\text{LOFF}} b^3 \sim 4 \text{ MeV}$. The resulting pinning force per unit length of vortex is of order $f_p \sim E_p/b^2 \sim (4 \text{ MeV})/(80 \text{ fm}^2)$. A complete calculation will be challenging because $b < \xi$, and is likely to yield an f_p which is somewhat less than that we have obtained by dimensional analysis. Note that our estimate of f_p is quite uncertain both because it is only based on dimensional analysis and because the values of Δ , b and F_{LOFF} are uncertain. (We have a reasonable understanding of all the ratios Δ/Δ_0 , $\delta\mu/\Delta_0$, q/Δ_0

and consequently $b\Delta_0$ in the LOFF phase. It is of course the value of the BCS gap Δ_0 which is uncertain.) It is premature to compare our crude result to the results of serious calculations of the pinning of crustal neutron vortices as in Refs. [36, 37, 33]. It is nevertheless remarkable that they prove to be similar: the pinning energy of neutron vortices in the inner crust is $E_p \approx 1 - 3$ MeV and the pinning force per unit length is $f_p \approx (1 - 3 \text{ MeV})/(200 - 400 \text{ fm}^2)$.

A quantitative theory of glitches originating within quark matter in a LOFF phase must await further calculations, in particular a three flavor analysis and the determination of the crystal structure of the QCD LOFF phase. However, our rough estimate of the pinning force on rotational vortices in a LOFF region suggests that this force may be comparable to that on vortices in the inner crust of a conventional neutron star. Perhaps, therefore, glitches occurring in a region of crystalline color superconducting quark matter may yield similar phenomenology to that observed. Were this to happen, we can hope that a more detailed analysis would reveal distinctions among observed glitches, with some better understood as conventional glitches, originating in the inner crust, and others better understood as glitches originating deep within the star, in quark matter in the crystalline color superconductor phase. This is surely strong motivation for further investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to my collaborators, Mark Alford, Jeff Bowers, Joydip Kundu, Adam Leibovich and Eugene Shuster, with whom I have been exploring crystalline color superconductivity. Let me also thank the organizers of QCD@WORK for bringing together theorists and experimentalists who are putting QCD to work in a variety of different arenas together for a stimulating conference in a very congenial setting. This research was supported in part by the DOE under cooperative research agreement #DF-FC02-94ER40818 and through an OJI Award, and by the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

REFERENCES

1. M. Alford, K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B537**, 443 (1999) [hep-ph/9804403]
2. R. Rapp, T. Schäfer, E. V. Shuryak and M. Velkovsky, Annals Phys. **280**, 35 (2000) [hep-ph/9904353]; T. Schäfer, Nucl. Phys. **B575**, 269 (2000); [hep-ph/9909574]; I. A. Shovkovy and L. C. Wijewardhana, Phys. Lett. **B470**, 189 (1999) [hep-ph/9910225]; N. Evans, J. Hormuzdiar, S. D. Hsu and M. Schwetz, Nucl. Phys. **B581**, 391 (2000) [hep-ph/9910313].
3. For reviews, see K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, hep-ph/0011333; M. Alford, hep-ph/0102047.
4. M. Alford, J. Berges and K. Rajagopal, Nucl. Phys. **B558**, 219 (1999) [hep-ph/9903502].
5. T. Schäfer and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 074014 (1999) [hep-ph/9903503].
6. For a review of the effective theory for the mesons of the CFL phase and references to the original literature, see the contribution of R. Casalbuoni to these proceedings, hep-th/0108195.
7. P. F. Bedaque and T. Schäfer, hep-ph/0105150. See also D. B. Kaplan and S. Reddy, hep-ph/0107265. Note that when $m_s \neq 0$, Δ is replaced by five different gap parameters which vary with m_s , at order m_s^2 [4]. Since the Δ 's occur quadratically in the free energy, there are contributions to the effective theory of the CFL mesons arising at order m_s^2 and m_s^4 . Their effects (along with those of the

electromagnetic and instanton-induced contributions to the meson masses) must be evaluated before firm conclusions about the effects of m_s^4 terms on K^0 condensation can be drawn.

8. V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, hep-ph/0108178; T. Schafer, D. T. Son, M. A. Stephanov, D. Toublan and J. J. Verbaarschot, hep-ph/0108210; D. T. Son, hep-ph/0108260.
9. K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3492 (2001) [hep-ph/0012039].
10. M. G. Alford, K. Rajagopal, S. Reddy and F. Wilczek, hep-ph/0105009.
11. For a recent exploration of the μ -dependence of m_s , see M. Buballa and M. Oertel, hep-ph/0109095.
12. B. Barrois, Nucl. Phys. **B129**, 390 (1977); D. Bailin and A. Love, Phys. Rept. **107**, 325 (1984); M. Alford, K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. **B422**, 247 (1998); R. Rapp, T. Schäfer, E. V. Shuryak and M. Velkovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 53 (1998).
13. A. I. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1136 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965)].
14. P. Fulde and R. A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964).
15. M. Alford, J. Bowers and K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 074016 (2001) [hep-ph/0008208].
16. J. A. Bowers, J. Kundu, K. Rajagopal and E. Shuster, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 014024 (2001) [hep-ph/0101067].
17. R. Casalbuoni, R. Gatto, M. Mannarelli and G. Nardulli, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 218 (2001) [hep-ph/0101326]; R. Casalbuoni, these proceedings, hep-th/0108195.
18. A. K. Leibovich, K. Rajagopal and E. Shuster, hep-ph/0104073.
19. A. M. Clogston, Phys. Rev. Lett. **9**, 266 (1962); B. S. Chandrasekhar, App. Phys. Lett. **1**, 7 (1962).
20. P. F. Bedaque, hep-ph/9910247.
21. S. Takada and T. Izuyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **41**, 635 (1969).
22. M. LeBellac, *Thermal Field Theory*, Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, 1996).
23. D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 074012 (2000) [hep-ph/9910491]; erratum, *ibid.* **D62**, 059902 (2000) [hep-ph/0004095]; D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 034007 (2000) [nucl-th/0001040]; G. Carter and D. Diakonov, Nucl. Phys. **B582**, 571 (2000) [hep-ph/0001318]; D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 054017 (2000) [nucl-th/0003063]; D. H. Rischke, nucl-th/0103050.
24. D. K. Hong, Phys. Lett. **B473**, 118 (2000) [hep-ph/9812510]; Nucl. Phys. **B582**, 451 (2000) [hep-ph/9905523].
25. A. I. Buzdin and V. V. Tugushev Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **85**, 735 (1983) [Sov. Phys. JETP **58**, 428 (1983)]; A. I. Buzdin and S. V. Polonskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **93**, 747 (1987) [Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 422 (1987)].
26. T. Schäfer and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 114033 (1999) [hep-ph/9906512].
27. K. Rajagopal and E. Shuster, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 085007 (2000) [hep-ph/0004074].
28. D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, hep-ph/0005225; K. Splittorff, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, hep-ph/0012274.
29. K. Splittorff, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, hep-ph/0012274.
30. A. Sedrakian, nucl-th/0008052. The related unpairing transition was discussed in the absence of LOFF pairing in A. Sedrakian and U. Lombardo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 602 (2000).
31. M. A. Alpar and C. Ho, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **204**, 655 (1983). For a recent review, see A.G. Lyne in *Pulsars: Problems and Progress*, S. Johnston, M. A. Walker and M. Bailes, eds., 73 (ASP, 1996).
32. J. Negele and D. Vautherin, Nucl. Phys. **A207**, 298 (1973).
33. For reviews, see D. Pines and A. Alpar, Nature **316**, 27 (1985); D. Pines, in *Neutron Stars: Theory and Observation*, J. Ventura and D. Pines, eds., 57 (Kluwer, 1991); M. A. Alpar, in *The Lives of Neutron Stars*, M. A. Alpar et al., eds., 185 (Kluwer, 1995). For more recent developments and references to further work, see M. Ruderman, Astrophys. J. **382**, 587 (1991); R. I. Epstein and G. Baym, Astrophys. J. **387**, 276 (1992); M. A. Alpar, H. F. Chau, K. S. Cheng and D. Pines, Astrophys. J. **409**, 345 (1993); B. Link and R. I. Epstein, Astrophys. J. **457**, 844 (1996); M. Ruderman, T. Zhu, and K. Chen, Astrophys. J. **492**, 267 (1998); A. Sedrakian and J. M. Cordes, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **307**, 365 (1999).
34. N. K. Glendenning, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1274 (1992); N. K. Glendenning, Compact Stars (Springer-Verlag, 1997); F. Weber, J. Phys. G. Nucl. Part. Phys. **25**, R195 (1999).
35. P. W. Anderson and N. Itoh, Nature **256**, 25 (1975).
36. M. A. Alpar, Astrophys. J. **213**, 527 (1977).
37. M. A. Alpar, P. W. Anderson, D. Pines and J. Shaham, Astrophys. J. **278**, 791 (1984).